|            | REVI | EW (Check one):            |      | HRP Guide 🛚              | TECH           | REPORT                |  |           |                 |                 |
|------------|------|----------------------------|------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| KEY<br>NO: | n/a  | PROJECT:                   | NCl  | HRP 15-33 FY 2006        |                | DESCRIPTION:          | AASHTO Guide for Transporta<br>Chapter 1 and 2 | tion Land | scape and Envir | onmental Design |
|            |      |                            | DATE | OF REVIEW:               | 6/6/2008       |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| REVIEWE    | 1.   | Greg viney                 |      | TCD                      | Б Кер.         | Iddilo                |  | DITTE     | OI KEVIEW.      | 0/0/2000        |
| COMMENT    |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| NUMBER     | _    | MMENT LOCATION             |      | COMMENT                  |                | aveno a il a m        |  |           | ACTION          |                 |
| 1          | Co   | ver                        |      | Consider changing top    | o line to AAS  | SHTO Guide for Tra    | nsportation Environmental Design               | 1         |                 |                 |
| 2          | Co   | ver                        |      | Designing Transportation | tion Projects  | into the Environmen   |  |           |                 |                 |
| 3          | Xii  | , last paragraph           |      | What is a "complete re   | oad". Is it co | oined phrase from th  | is guide or is it something I should           | d know?   |                 |                 |
| 4          | Xii  | i, last paragraph          |      | "NEPA by furtheri        | ng the integr  | ration of environmen  | tal design into highway planning.              |           |                 |                 |
| 5          |      | ge 3, Fig 1                |      | Looks like the end is i  | missing.       |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 6          | Pag  | ge 3, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para |      | I keep wanting to put    | a heading on   | n the paragraph of Co | ntext Analysis                                 |           |                 |                 |
| 7          |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 8          |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 9          |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 10         |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 11         |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |
| 12         |      |                            |      |                          |                |                       |  |           |                 |                 |

Project: Key # Date: Page 1 of 5

| 13 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 14 |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |

| Proj | ect: |
|------|------|
| Key  | #    |

| 28 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 29 |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |
| 31 |  |  |
| 32 |  |  |
| 33 |  |  |
| 34 |  |  |
| 35 |  |  |
| 36 |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |
| 38 |  |  |
| 39 |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |
| 41 |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |

| Project: |
|----------|
| Kev#     |

| 43         44         45         46         47         48         49         50 |
|---|
| 45       46       47       48       49  |
| 46       47       48       49   |
| 47       48       49  |
| 48 49   |
| 49  |
|   |
| 50  |
|   |
| 51  |
| 52  |
| 53  |
| 54  |
| 55  |
| 56  |
| 57  |

| Project: |  |
|----------|--|
| Kev#     |  |

| 58 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 59 |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |
| 61 |  |  |
| 62 |  |  |
| 63 |  |  |
|    |  |  |
|    |  |  |
|    |  |  |

Project: Key # Date: Page 5 of 5

|                   | REVII     | EW (Check one):   | NCHRP Guide 🛛                   |  | REPORT                                       |   |        |            |          |
|-------------------|-----------|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--------|------------|----------|
| KEY<br>NO:        | Chapter 3 |   |                                 | on Lands                               | cape and Envir                               | onmental Design   |        |            |          |
| REVIEWE           | R:        | Greg Vitley   |                                 | TCED Rep:                              | Idaho  |   | DATE ( | OF REVIEW: | 6/6/2008 |
|                   |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| COMMENT<br>NUMBER | CO        | MMENT LOCATION  |                                 |  |  |   |        | ACTION     |          |
| 1                 | _         | ge 17, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph 3 <sup>rd</sup><br>tence | How about: Se                   | nsibility in environ                   | mental design can ad                         | d   |        |            |          |
| 2                 | _         | ge 17, 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph 2 <sup>nd</sup><br>tence |                                 |  | oined? How about: H<br>n effective corridor. | aving good data on what works and   | why    |            |          |
| 3                 | Pag       | ge 21, 3.2 General  | This seems like land use author |  | ntion the importance                         | of working with and getting buy in  | from   |            |          |
| 4                 | Con       | nclusion, after the dash                                  | stakeholders ar                 | re matched. We want all convictions. A | ant to say that matchin                      | ult to keep if the expectations of the ng stakeholder's convictions improved, 'with full community support' | res    |            |          |
| 5                 |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 6                 |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 7                 |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 8                 |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 9                 |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 10                |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 11                |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |
| 12                |           |   |                                 |  |  |   |        |            |          |

Project: Key #

Date:

Page 1 of 5

| 13 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 14 |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |
| 26 |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |

| Proj | ect: |
|------|------|
| Key  | #    |

| 28 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 29 |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |
| 31 |  |  |
| 32 |  |  |
| 33 |  |  |
| 34 |  |  |
| 35 |  |  |
| 36 |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |
| 38 |  |  |
| 39 |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |
| 41 |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |

| Project: |
|----------|
| Kev#     |

| 43         44         45         46         47         48         49         50 |
|---|
| 45       46       47       48       49  |
| 46       47       48       49   |
| 47       48       49  |
| 48 49   |
| 49  |
|   |
| 50  |
|   |
| 51  |
| 52  |
| 53  |
| 54  |
| 55  |
| 56  |
| 57  |

| Project: |  |
|----------|--|
| Kev#     |  |

| 58 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 59 |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |
| 61 |  |  |
| 62 |  |  |
| 63 |  |  |
|    |  |  |
|    |  |  |
|    |  |  |

Project: Key # Date: Page 5 of 5

| TYPE OF R         | REVIEW (Check one):                                 | NCHRP Guide 🛚   | TECH   | REPORT  |  |                 |                 |          |
|-------------------|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| KEY 1<br>NO:      | n/a PROJECT:  | NCHRP 15-33 FY  | CHRP 15-33 FY 2006 DESCRIPTION: AASHTO Guide for Transportation La Chapter 4   |   | on Land                                  | scape and Envir | onmental Design |          |
| REVIEWE           | R: Greg Vitley                                      | •   | TCED Rep:  | Idaho   |  | DATE            | OF REVIEW:      | 6/6/2008 |
|                   |   |   |  |   |  |                 |                 |          |
| COMMENT<br>NUMBER | COMMENT LOCATIO                                     |   |  |   |  |                 | ACTION          |          |
| 1                 | Page 27, caption on pic                             | determinant of  | Perhaps reflect the first sentence of the first paragraph a little better. Ie: Geometrics are a major leterminant of how well a road fits into the landscape.  |   |  |                 |                 |          |
| 2                 | Page28, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para, 5 <sup>th</sup> line  | Consider using  | , 'environmental se  | ensibility'                                     |  |                 |                 |          |
| 3                 | Page 29, 1 <sup>st</sup> para, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line | Delete 'can' af   | ter designer.  |   |  |                 |                 |          |
| 4                 | Page 31, Pavement, general                          | climatic challer<br>some cases by<br>Mark Swanlun<br>and pavement | Consider a bit more on pavement design and how it affects noise? Quiet pavement's design life, climatic challenges, materials, textures and porosity etc. Noise reduction can be achieved in some cases by minor changes in pavement design with little additional cost. A good contact is Mark Swanlund (202-336-1323) who is contracted with FHWA regarding tire pavement noise and pavement design. |   |  |                 |                 |          |
| 5                 | Page 39, Bridges                                    | wildlife and fis<br>minimizes pier                                | Impacts of a bridge foot print can be very important to minimizing or improving impacts to wildlife and fish habitat. Ie: Longer bridges to allow for wildlife to pass underneath and minimizes piers in water. May decrease road wildlife road mortality and improves wildlife connectivity. Also consider something on designs which maintain historic integrity of a bridge                         |   |  |                 |                 |          |
| 6                 | Page 42, Retaining Wa<br>General                    |   |  | sues associated with<br>ump the rail to their o | this element such as trapping them eath. | on the          |                 |          |
| 7                 | Page 43, Retaining Wall general                     | s, Although it app  | olies it was a little s  | strange to see noise w                          | alls under the retaining wall section    | 1.              |                 |          |
| 8                 | Page 45, Medians                                    | In arid states it   | may be best to not   | plant much at all                               |  |                 |                 |          |
| 9                 | Page 53, Public Art, bul                            | ets Perhaps add on  | e: Help communiti  | es develop a 'sense c                           | f place'.                                |                 |                 |          |

Project: Key #

Date:

| 10 | Page 59, 4 <sup>th</sup> para  | 1st sent: After erosion add –and sediment 2nd sent: the SWPP should be referred to per EPA Construction General Permit as Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan(SWPPP). After all, if we could prevent storm water we wouldn't need to worry about the pollution in it. Additionally, mention importance of designing for erosion and sediment control is best started early in design rather than as an after thought. The plan should be integral to the design. |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 11 | Page 60, graphic   | Great example pic for sustainability.  |  |
| 12 | Page 61, Vegetation, 5 <sup>th</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> sent      | I guess global warming is now being considered factual by the government. Is the evidence irrefutable? –had to say it.   |  |
| 13 | General  | Much better use of examples in this version!   |  |
| 14 | Page 64, 4 <sup>th</sup> para, general                               | Is the calc correct? In 20 seconds at 55 mph I think I would go see much more than 30 feet. Nearly a half mile.  |  |
| 15 | Page 65, general   | Costs associated with incorrect plant selection can be exorbitant.   |  |
| 16 | Page 68, 5 <sup>th</sup> para  | Great statement.   |  |
| 17 | Page 74, Noise Abatement, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, 1 <sup>st</sup> line | Consider that with a berm neither the receiver nor the source can be close to the barrier, therefore, even though they may be a little better the cost associated with ROW and the benefit not realized because of the difference may cause it to be a wash. I recommend removing the 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence. Also, berms can provide opportunities for DOT to work with adjacent owners to provide property needed.   |  |
| 18 | Page 75, 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet                                      | I think it should be from the barrier to the receiver rather than the edge of pavement.  |  |
| 19 | Page 75, vegetative buffers  | This is not cost effective in most cases, especially in arid climates because the cost of needed ROW. Then, at 100 feet you will see a drop in noise levels just from the distance the receiver is away from the source. If you are talking about a preservation situation I understand.   |  |
| 20 | Page 77, General   | Wildlife crossing are a major movement in the U.S. Consider more discussion on this. Ie: rules of thumb for design, direction on how and when to consider them and placement, what makes them ineffective? Or, reference to a guidance document.   |  |
| 21 | Page 84, last para, 1 <sup>st</sup> sent                             | Consider quotes around "view of the road".   |  |

Project: Key # Date: Page 2 of 5

| 22 | Page 94 | Consider mention of the importance of DOT's and land use authorities to work together to ease the trouble of changing access control. Planning a secondary system is difficult if access control is changed on an existing highway. Local land use authorities can be huge assets to developing a system that minimizes congestion and traffic conflicts with local cities. Ie: locals using state systems for their local commutes rather than being able to stay off the state system to move with in their own towns. This may not be an issue in all parts of the county. |  |
|----|---------|---|--|
| 23 |         |   |  |
| 24 |         |   |  |
| 25 |         |   |  |
| 26 |         |   |  |
| 27 |         |   |  |
| 28 |         |   |  |
| 29 |         |   |  |
| 30 |         |   |  |
| 31 |         |   |  |
| 32 |         |   |  |
| 33 |         |   |  |
| 34 |         |   |  |
| 35 |         |   |  |

Project: Key # Date: Page 3 of 5

| 36 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 37 |  |  |
| 38 |  |  |
| 39 |  |  |
| 40 |  |  |
| 41 |  |  |
| 42 |  |  |
| 43 |  |  |
| 44 |  |  |
| 45 |  |  |
| 46 |  |  |
| 47 |  |  |
| 48 |  |  |
| 49 |  |  |
| 50 |  |  |

| Project: |  |
|----------|--|
| Kev#     |  |

| 51 |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 31 |  |  |
| 52 |  |  |
| 53 |  |  |
| 54 |  |  |
| 55 |  |  |
| 56 |  |  |
| 57 |  |  |
| 58 |  |  |
| 59 |  |  |
| 60 |  |  |
| 61 |  |  |
| 62 |  |  |
| 63 |  |  |
|    |  |  |
|    |  |  |
| 62 |  |  |

| Project: |  |
|----------|--|
| Key#     |  |

| F | ?FV          | ΊFW | I CO | MN | IFNT | SH | IFFT | • |
|---|--------------|-----|------|----|------|----|------|---|
|   | <b>.</b> _ v |     |      |    |      |    |      |   |

| _ |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |

Project: Key #

Date: Page 6 of 5



